

REMARKS

The office action of October 24, 2003 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-5 and 10-19 remain in this application. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to correct minor informalities in the claim format. These amendments have not been made responsive to a rejection and do not constitute a narrowing amendment. Claims 20-25 have been added. Claims 6-9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested based upon the above amendments and the following arguments.

Claim Rejections

Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Poole, "*Mac OS 8.5 Bible*" (hereinafter Poole). With respect to claim 1, the office action alleges that Poole teaches providing an operating system user interface manipulable by a user, a graphical representation of an item, and a user selectable property in the form of a date column that can be selected for sorting (found at page 159, first paragraph and Figure 7-9).

Claim 1 recites:

- A method of providing a graphical user interface to an operating system of a computer having a video screen, comprising the steps of:
 - a. providing an operating system user interface manipulable by a user,
 - b. providing a frame controlled by the operating system, the frame including a graphical representation of an item and at least one slot containing a user-selected property of the item, and
 - c. displaying a view of the frame on the video screen.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Poole fails to show a frame with at least one slot containing a *user-selected property* of the item. The first paragraph on page 159 of Poole recites:

The Navigation services dialogue box does the same job as the Open dialogue box but eliminates many of its shortcomings. The

scrolling list of files, called the browser, looks and operates a lot like the list view of the Finder. You see the icon, name, and modification date of every item in the folder or disk volume named at the top of the list. For each listed item, the modification date automatically expands from the longest date format (Friday, January 1, 1999) to the shortest format (1/1/99) depending on the space available. You can click the column headings to sort the list by name or date. You can also reverse the sort order by clicking the triangular sort direction indicator at the right end of the headings (above the scroll bar).

As explained in the specification of the present invention at paragraph 32, a frame is a “defined boundary or perimeter on a graphic user interface within which is typically placed graphical representations for resources on the operating system. The area within the boundaries of the frame 502 is composed of slots....” According to an illustrative, but not limiting, implementation of the claim 1 invention as described in paragraph 35 of the specification as filed, “[t]he selected sort property may be displayed in one of the slots on the tile to provide the user with a quick identification of the sort order.”

Thus, according to claim 1 of the present invention, a frame is provided in which the content of one of the slots contains a property selected by the user. Nowhere does Poole teach, suggest or otherwise disclose this feature. Poole shows a dialog box including a scrolling list of files in figure 7-9. In describing figure 7-9 on page 159, Poole discloses that a user sees “the icon, name, and modification date of *every item* in the folder or disk volume named at the top of the list.” (Emphasis added). Thus, one column of the list contains an icon, a second column of the list contains a name, and a third column of the list contains a modification date. Notably, according to Poole, the user cannot determine which properties are displayed in these columns. Rather, the properties are automatically selected by the system. The mere fact that the user may select a column heading to sort by a particular property does not in any way teach or suggest that the property contained in the given column is user-selected. Therefore, Poole lacks a teaching or suggestion of a frame with at least one slot containing a *user-selected property* of the item as called for in claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable over Poole.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are also allowable over Poole as being dependent upon an allowable base claim and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

With respect to claims 6-9, the office action alleges that Poole discloses each of the recited features in the claims. Applicants have canceled claims 6-9 rendering these rejections moot.

The office action contended that each of the features of claim 10 was disclosed in Poole at page 159, paragraph 1 and in figure 7-9. Applicants submit that Poole fails to teach or suggest at least "a database component for storing properties specific to an item type" as recited in amended claim 10.

Figure 7-9 in Poole shows a listing of files and folders in a window. A first column contains a list of file/folder names along with icons that represent the files/folders. A second column, titled "Date Modified" lists the date that the file/folder was modified. Poole further discloses in paragraph 1 (page 159) "the icon, name, and modification date of every item in the folder or disk volume named at the top of the list." None of the properties of each item shown in Poole are specific to items of that type. The icon image, the name, and the modification date are properties of each and every item in the list, regardless of its type. Thus, contrary to the position asserted in the office action, these properties cannot be item type specific. The remaining portions of Poole cited in the action likewise fail to teach or suggest a database component for storing properties specific to an item type for an item of that type as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 10 is allowable over Poole. In addition, claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

With respect to claim 13 the office action asserts that Poole disclosed each claimed feature either at page 109, paragraph 2 and in figure 6-3; at page 162, paragraph 5; or at page 159, paragraph 1 and in figure 7-9. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13 because Poole clearly fails to teach or suggest at least a "tile menu entry" as recited in claim 13.

In figure 6-3 of Poole, a set of menu entry items is shown. For example, a view “as Icons” entry is displayed at the top of the drop down menu. A view “as Buttons” entry and a view “as List” entry is likewise shown. However, nowhere in this list of menu entry items or elsewhere does Poole provide a teaching or suggestion of a “tile menu entry” as recited in claim 13. Claims 14-17 and 19 depend from claim 13, and are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable based claim and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

Claim Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Poole. Applicants submit that claim 18 is allowable as depending from allowable base claim 13 and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

New Claims 20-25

Claims 20-25 have been added. Applicants submit that each of these claims is fully supported by the specification and allowable over the prior art of record. For example, none of the cited art alone or in combination teaches or suggests, among other features, receiving a user selection of a property for the file type of the file; and displaying the selected property with a graphical representation of the file as recited in independent claim 20.

Application No.: 09/832,966
Amendment dated Jan. 23, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 24, 2003

Conclusion

If any fees are required for this submission, or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733 accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 23, 2004

By:



Gary D. Fedorochko

Reg. No. 35,509

Reg. No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001